amongst the landless rural poor. The Ministry have also prescribed submission of Quarterly Progress Reports by the State government regarding distribution of ceiling surplus land, Bhoodan Land and Government Wastelands.

Evaluation of DPAP

1593. SHRI K. RAHMAN KHAN: Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that drought prone area has increased from 55.3 million hectares in 1973 to 74.6 million hectares in 1995, although Rs.2195 crore have been spent on DPAP as reported by the CAG in his report on Drought Prone Areas;

(b) if so, whether Government have ever evaluated the efficacy of the programme; and

(c) if so, what remedial action Government propose to take in the matter?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI ANNASAHEB M. K. PATIL) : (a) to (c) The Drought prone Programme (DPAP) was launched during 1973-74 to cover 54 districts together with part of another 18 districts contiguous with them for execution of drought proofing works. Subsequently the coverage of the Programme was extended to cover 55.3 million hectares of area identified as drought prone. Following a review of the Programme by a high level Technical Committee in 1994, the coverage of the Programme was further expanded to 74.6 million hectares from 1995-96. This increase in coverage is mainly on account of adoption of scientific criteria for identification of drought prone areas and the decision of the Government for continued treatment of areas already included under the programme though they had been recommended for deletion by the high level Technical Committee. Though the coverage of area under DPAP has increased overtime, the fact is that the coverage under the Programme is still below the potential problem area that needs treatment for drought proofing.

From 1995-96, the Programme is being implemented on watershed basis in accordance with the Guidelines for Watershed Development. The impact assessment studies commissioned by the Ministry indicate that

with the implementation of watershed projects under DPAP, there has been an increase in the productivity of land, water table, availability of fuel and fodder in the project areas. There has also been significant impact on overall economic development of the project areas. Keeping in view the experience of implementing the Programme for 6 years, the Guidelines have further been revised in September, 2001 for a focussed approach in watershed development through greater role of Panchayati Raj Institutions and Self help Groups of the landless poor especially SCs/STs, establishing credit linkages with financial institutions etc.

Implementation of pilot sector reforms programme

1594. SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that pilot sector reforms programme has not yielded expected results in the districts where it is being implemented;

(b) if so, the problems faced by the districts in taking up the programme;

(c) the districts selected for the pilot projects and the progress made in physical terms;

(d) the steps being taken by Government to make the pilot project a success;and

(e) the status of the project in Andhra Pradesh?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI ANNASAHEB M. K. PATIL) : (a) and (b) The Sector Reforms Projects envisage to institutionalise community participation on demand responsive mode in the Rural Water Supply activities, to ensure sustainability of the drinking water supply sources and systems. Being a new reforms initiative and Process Projects, the implementation of the Project in some of the districts is better and some of the districts projects progress is slove. Main reasons for this are that the software components of the Projects, like Information, Education and Communication, Human Resource Development and Capacity Development take longer time. These components normally precede the implementation of drinking water works. The reforms concept and principles being new, and the lack of capacity amongst the key stakeholders to implement such innovative projects are also some of the reasons for slow progress.